

## REMARKS

The last Office Action of June 4, 2007 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration of the instant application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 12-22 are pending in the application. Claims 12-15 have been withdrawn from further consideration. Applicant herewith affirms the withdrawal of claims 12-15 from further consideration. Claims 16, 20, 21 have been amended. No claim has been canceled or added. No amendment to the specification has been made. No fee is due.

Claim 20 is objected to because of an informality. Claim 20 has now been amended in the manner as suggested by the Examiner.

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. Appl. Publ. No. 2003/0075996 to Yoshida et al.

Claims 16, 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshida et al. in view of U.S. Pat. Appl. Publ. No. 2003/0030333 to Johnsen.

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshida et al. in view of Johnsen, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 4,498,024 to Moretti et al.

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshida et al. in view of Johnsen, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,889,342 to Hasebe et al.

Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshida et al. in view of Johnsen, and Hasebe et al., and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,122,704 to Blakeley et al.

Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshida et al. in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,097,116 to Hess et al.

Record is also made of a telephonic interview between applicant's representative and the Examiner which took place on June 19, 2007. At the

interview, applicant's representative noted that the Yoshida et al. publication is not available as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) because it is based on an international PCT application that was not published in English and filed after November 29, 2000. However, the corresponding international PCT publication WO 2002/049193 is available as prior art pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 102(b) because it is published more than one year prior to the U.S. filing date of above-referenced patent application. The Examiner agreed and provided applicant with a translation of the corresponding international PCT publication.

In order to clearly distinguish the present invention from Yoshida et al., applicant has amended independent claims 16 and 20 by setting forth the positional relationship between the cooling channel protrusion and the cooling channel. More specifically, claims 16 and 21 set forth that the cooling channel protrusion extends in prolongation of the cooling channel in the area of the end winding.

Yoshida et al. discloses a cooling structure having a cooling jacket with a cooling channel. Reference numeral 27 which the Examiner interprets as an equivalent to a "cooling channel protrusion", refers to an cooling oil exit which extends at a right angle to the cooling channel. As a result, the cooling jacket becomes increased in diameter, as opposed to the present invention, in which the housing remains basically unchanged by the provision of the cooling channel protrusion.

For the reasons set forth above, it is applicant's contention that Yoshida neither alone or in combination with any other cited prior art teaches or suggests the features of the present invention, as recited in claims 16 and 21.

As for the rejection of the dependent claims, these claims depend on claims 16 and 21, respectively, share their presumably allowable features, and therefore it is respectfully submitted that these claims should also be allowed.

Applicant has also carefully scrutinized the further cited prior art and finds it without any relevance to the claims on file. It is thus felt that no specific discussion thereof is necessary.

In view of the above presented remarks and amendments, it is respectfully submitted that all claims on file should be considered patentably differentiated over the art and should be allowed.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner consider necessary or desirable any formal changes anywhere in the specification, claims and/or drawing, then it is respectfully requested that such changes be made by Examiner's Amendment, if the Examiner feels this would facilitate passage of the case to issuance. If the Examiner feels that it might be helpful in advancing this case by calling the undersigned, applicant would greatly appreciate such a telephone interview.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Henry M. Feiereisen  
Agent For Applicant  
Reg. No: 31,084

Date: August 31, 2007  
350 Fifth Avenue  
Suite 4714  
New York, N.Y. 10118  
(212)244-5500  
HMF:af